

## **Mountainous Planning District Planning Commission**

### **Special Working Meeting Agenda**

**Tuesday, April 19, 2016 3:30 P.M.**

#### **Location**

SALT LAKE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER  
2001 SOUTH STATE STREET, ROOM S1-120  
SOUTH BUILDING, MAIN FLOOR  
(385) 468-6700

*UPON REQUEST, WITH 5 WORKING DAYS NOTICE, REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS FOR QUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS MAY BE PROVIDED. PLEASE CONTACT WENDY GURR AT 385-468-6707.*

*TTY USERS SHOULD CALL 711.*

The Planning Commission Public Meeting is a public forum where, depending on the agenda item, the Planning Commission may receive comment and recommendations from applicants, the public, applicable agencies and County staff regarding land use applications and other items on the Commission's agenda. In addition, it is where the Planning Commission takes action on these items, which may include: approval, approval with conditions, denial, continuance or recommendation to other bodies as applicable.

### **PUBLIC MEETING**

**29717** – Mountain Resort Zone - Discussion and work session regarding issues raised during the public hearing.

1. Review of potential motion items (based on issues previously addressed in work meetings)

2. Discussion of the following issues:

A. Regarding the FCOZ exceptions provision in MRZ recreation district (19.13.030.C), discuss:

- “automatic” waivers vs. planning commission decisions?
- separate the issues of slope waiver and ridgeline waiver, or leave them together?
- If this provision is left in the ordinance, are there uses on the exception list of that should be removed?

B. Should the list of uses under “mountain resorts” in the MRZ village be the same list as in the MRZ recreation zone (i.e. eliminate recreational sports field, skating rink, skateboard park...)?

C. Regarding FCOZ exceptions in the MRZ village, discuss:

- exceptions for both slope and ridgeline (or neither)?
- “automatic” exceptions list to be eliminated, reduced, or left as-is?

- If eliminated, should the exceptions process outlined in paragraph 3 remain and apply to all exception requests?

D. Regarding TDRs (transfers of development rights): should allowance be made—possibly at a lesser ratio—for TDRs from properties without current water available? [Or should the requirement for water simply be eliminated from 19.13.080.E(1)(e)?]

E. Also regarding TDRs, should only land with slopes less than 30% be considered “developable” for transferring development rights? If steeper sloped properties are to be allowed as “sending” properties, should ratios be developed for 100% buildable land, and different ratios for “constrained” land?

F. Regarding tree replacement for the removal of trees to clear ski terrain: should there be an exception inserted into the ordinance (over and above that which is allowed for “minor ski resort improvements?”) Or, based on the sheer number of trees likely to be removed for a new ski run, should the normal tree replacement requirement be replaced with a “forestry rehabilitation plan” or some other such plan that the resort would have to implement and fund?

G. Regarding setbacks in MRZ village areas: should exceptions be allowed (or perhaps only allowed for property lines within the interior of the resort)?

H. Should 19.13.070(D)(2) be amended to include an environmental assessment (comparison to County “dashboard” data if available)?

### **ADJOURN**